



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES OF CASES.

FORGETFULNESS AS CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE—PETERS. v. CITY OF LYNCHBURG.—Our readers are requested to note that the case of *Peters v. City of Lynchburg*, decided by the Circuit Court of the City of Lynchburg and reported in our January number (p. 812), possesses not only the authority given it by the able judge who rendered the opinion, but has the additional authority imparted to it by reason of the fact that the case was taken to the Court of Appeals and a writ of error there refused. This fact adds to the authority of the case of *Courtney v. City of Richmond*, 32 Gratt. 792, and shows that the court intends to adhere to the very stringent rule laid down in that case. Another opinion which should be noted in this connection is *N. & W. v. Hawks*, 102 Va. 452, 455, in which the court said it makes do difference that the danger was not in the plaintiff's mind. Such thoughtlessness is negligence which cannot be charged to the defendant company.

NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENTS—DEPOSIT OF DRAFT FOR COLLECTION—BANK ACQUIRES NO TITLE AND CANNOT RECOVER AGAINST ACCEPTORS—VA. CODE 1904, SEC. 2841A, ART. 4, SEC. 51.—In *Bank of America v. Waydell and Bagley*, decided March, 1905, the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of New York held that where a draft was sent to agents for collection who were depositors of the plaintiff bank and deposited with the plaintiff solely for collection, the plaintiff having knowledge of the relation of their depositors to the draft, and plaintiff did not make advances or otherwise part with value upon the faith of the transaction, but afterwards assumed to apply the amount of the draft upon an indebtedness due to it from the depositors, the plaintiff had acquired no title to the draft and could not recover for the same against the acceptors (*Hutchinson v. Manhattan Co.*, 152 N. Y. 250; *Hatch v. National Bank*, 147 N. Y. 184, distinguished).

Sec. 51 of the Negotiable Instrument Law (Va. Code 1904, sec. 2841a, Art. 4; sec. 51), providing that "the holder of a negotiable instrument may sue thereon in his own name and payment to him in due course discharges the instrument" was held not to require a different ruling from that above.

LIBEL BY DICTATION TO STENOGRAPHER.—Are communications dictated to a stenographer, containing libelous matter, privileged? The use of stenographers in all business matters, including the most confidential communications by lawyers, makes this subject a most important one. It has undergone judicial consideration in two American cases, *Gambrill v. Schooley*, 93 Md. 48, and *Owen v. Ogilvie Pub. Co.*, 32 N. Y. App. Div. 465. In the former case the court held that the dictation of a libelous letter to a private and confidential stenographer was, in law, a libel-publication, when a typewritten copy was signed, made and sent to the addressee. In the latter case it was held that the dictation of a letter by the manager of a corporation to its stenographer is not a publication. The